



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,888	09/17/2003	Xin Xue	SONY-26400	9089
7590	02/02/2010		EXAMINER	
Jonathan O. Owens HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP 162 North Wolfe Road Sunnyvale, CA 94086			BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,888	XUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOUGLAS B. BLAIR	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 and 29-51 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 and 29-51 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/4/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 and 29-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,848,064 to Cowan.

See the mapping of claim 1 below. The content disclosed is the types of media claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 18-19, 34-39, 41-47, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,848,064 to Cowan in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,117,482 to Nguyen et al.

As to claim 1, Cowan teaches a version based content distribution system comprising: content comprising a version number (col. 2, lines 37-55); a syndicator, wherein the syndicator is configured to transmit the version number (col. 2, lines 37-55); a subscriber content comprising a subscriber version number (col. 2, lines 37-55); a subscriber configured to store the subscriber content, to compare the version number with the subscriber content version number, and to receive the content from the syndicator if the version number is different from the subscriber content version number (col. 2, lines 37-55); however Cowan does not explicitly teach the comparison determining which version is larger.

Nguyen teaches a method for comparing software version number by determining which number is larger (See Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cowan regarding subscriber version management with the teachings of Nguyen regarding comparing the size of version numbers because Nguyen provides a specific example of the broad comparison method discussed by

Cowan. One of ordinary skill in the art would be able to compare numbers to determine which one is greater.

As to claim 2, Cowan downloads from a server.

As to claim 3, Cowan teaches a display.

As to claim 4-6 and 37-39, Cowan teaches a mobile device which is broad enough to cover a PDA.

As to claim 7, Cowan teaches a "predetermined transfer method" as claimed.

As to claim 8-10, the transfer in Cowan is considered application driven, isochronous, and one way.

As to claim 11, Cowan uses a network so one of ordinary skill would recognize the use of an "IP method" as broadly claimed.

As to claim 12, In Cowan the user controls what is downloaded. This is considered a preference.

As to claims 13-14, these features are inherent to a web server.

As to claims 18-19, they are rejected for the same reasoning as claims 32-33.

As to claim 34, it rejected for the same reasoning as claim 1.

Claims 35 and its dependents are rejected for the same reasoning as claim 1 and its dependents.

Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are rejected for similar reasoning.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,848,064 to Cowan in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,990,498 to Fenton et al.

As to claims 15-17, Cowan teaches claim 1; however Cowan does not discuss the use of a tree structure.

Fenton teaches the tree structure claimed in claims 15-17 (See Abstract for example).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cowan regarding the distribution of content by comparing version numbers with the teachings of Fenton regarding a tree structure because a tree structure is an efficient method for providing data to users.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,848,064 to Cowan in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,119,165 to Li et al.

As to claim 20, Cowan makes obvious claim 1; however Cowan does not explicitly teach a proxy as claimed in claim 20.

Li teaches a proxy as claimed in claim 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cowan regarding the distribution of content by comparing version numbers with the teachings of Li regarding using a proxy in a separate computer because a proxy allows a client to access the internet using a singular portal (Background of Li).

Claims 31, 40, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,848,064 to Cowan in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0042073 by Saether et al.

As to claim 31, Cowan anticipates claim 29; however Cowan does not teach a version identifier comprising a date and time stamp.

Saether teaches a version identifier comprising a time stamp (paragraph 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cowan regarding the distribution of content by comparing version numbers with the teachings of Saether regarding version comprised of time stamps because time stamps are one possible specific implementation of the broad disclosure on version numbers provided by Cowan.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,888
Art Unit: 2442

Page 7

/Douglas B Blair/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442